

1 **Q. IS VERIZON'S ASSUMPTION OF ONLY DE MINIMIS SHARING OF**
2 **TRENCHES IN UNDERGROUND PLANT REASONABLE?**

3 A. No. Like buried plant, underground plant requires trenches but also includes
4 conduit through which the cables run. While the conduit may not be shared, the
5 trenches can be shared, just as they can for buried plant.

6 Underground structure is typically found in more densely populated areas.
7 Municipal regulations generally discourage the indiscriminate opening of streets
8 and sidewalks. Moreover, for safety reasons, it is not unusual for municipalities
9 to prohibit street openings during holidays and inclement weather. Many local
10 municipalities also require that opened streets must be completely repaved, rather
11 than patched. As a result, when streets are opened, restoration costs can be quite
12 high. For these and other reasons, companies look for structure-sharing
13 opportunities. Certainly, the sharing of the trench into which conduits are placed
14 is one such opportunity. Frequently, when roads are widened facilities are
15 removed from the overhead pole line and placed underground. While the
16 construction is in progress, the participants jointly share the open street for
17 placement of conduits and manholes. Although the number of available partners
18 for sharing trenches for underground plant is smaller than for buried plant, it is
19 reasonable to conclude, at a minimum, that the cost of the trench itself can be
20 shared by two partners. This would result in a 50% sharing factor adjustment to
21 the Verizon cost study.

1 **Q. DID THE FCC INCLUDE ANY ADJUSTMENTS FOR SHARING OF**
2 **TRENCHES IN ITS SYNTHESIS MODEL?**

3 A. Yes. The FCC, in developing the inputs to the Synthesis Model, recognizes that a
4 firm entering the market today would take full advantage of structure-sharing
5 opportunities. Overall, just as we have here, the Synthesis Model assumes that the
6 new telephone entrant would bear 33% of the cost of the buried cable trench and
7 50% of the underground conduit plant. The difference would be paid by other
8 utilities with which the facilities would be shared.

9 **G. GROWTH**

10 **Q. DOES THE VERIZON MODEL PROPERLY HANDLE GROWTH?**

11 A. No. Although the Verizon cost study's input assumptions provide for a large
12 amount of spare capacity in the forward-looking outside plant, Verizon's cost
13 study fails to reflect that as this spare capacity is consumed by new customers in
14 the future, the average cost per line will decline because the initial investment cost
15 will be spread over more lines.

16 **Q. HAVE YOU CORRECTED VERIZON'S STUDY TO PROPERLY**
17 **ACCOUNT FOR FUTURE ANTICIPATED GROWTH?**

18 A. Yes. The modifications we have made to Verizon's cost study inputs still provide
19 for substantial spare capacity. Thus, unit costs will decrease with future growth.

20 As a result, we have included in our restatement of Verizon's cost studies a

21 **[BEGIN VERIZON PROPRIETARY] *** [END VERIZON**

22 **PROPRIETARY]** estimate of annual growth. This approximates the average

23 growth in the number of working lines Verizon has experienced in Virginia over

24 the last three years, based on the Loop Analysis Reporting and Tracking (LART)

1 information provided in discovery. It is also consistent with the average growth
2 assumptions used by Verizon's outside plant engineers in projecting repair and
3 maintenance expense savings to be produced by the replacement of cable
4 facilities. We modified the VCost module of the cost studies to compute the
5 present value of 5 years of growth at the forecasted rate. The method we used
6 properly reflects that the cost per unit (i.e., line) will decrease as additional
7 demand units materialize.

8 **H. FORWARD-LOOKING NETWORK ADJUSTMENT FACTOR**

9 **Q. WHAT IS THE FORWARD-LOOKING-TO-CURRENT FACTOR**
10 **INCLUDED BY VERIZON IN ITS COST STUDY?**

11 A. The forward-looking-to-current ("FLC") adjustment is an adjustment factor
12 proposed by Verizon to allegedly compensate for its method of calculating
13 expenses which ostensibly reduces these expenses inappropriately in a forward-
14 looking network. Because Verizon calculates expenses based on the ratio of
15 investment to expenses, expenses will automatically be projected to decrease
16 when investment decreases in a forward-looking network. Verizon therefore
17 adjusts its expenses based on the relationship of forward-looking investment to
18 embedded investment observed by Verizon in the recent New York proceeding.
19 Verizon estimates that an FLC of 80% is needed to properly recover forward-
20 looking expenses.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ See Panel Testimony at 75.

1 **Q. HOW IS THE FLC APPLIED IN VERIZON'S STUDY?**

2 A. Verizon multiplies its historical investments by 80% before computing its
3 expense-to-investment ratios, thereby decreasing the investment base and
4 increasing the resulting ratio. This, in turn, increases its forward-looking costs.

5 **Q. IS VERIZON'S FORWARD-LOOKING-TO-CURRENT FACTOR**
6 **CONSISTENT WITH TELRIC PRINCIPLES?**

7 A. No. Verizon's forward-looking-to-current factor is a thinly veiled attempt to
8 recoup the operating costs of its embedded, inefficient network. It should be
9 rejected.

10 **Q. VERIZON ARGUES THAT SUCH AN ADJUSTMENT IS NECESSARY**
11 **BECAUSE THE EXPENSE FACTORS ARE BASED ON CURRENT**
12 **EXPENSE-TO-INVESTMENT RATIOS AND, ON THAT BASIS, LOWER**
13 **TELRIC INVESTMENT LEVELS WILL EFFECTIVELY PRODUCE A**
14 **WINDFALL REDUCTION IN EXPENSES. DO YOU AGREE?**

15 A. Absolutely not. Rather than remaining constant as Verizon suggests, expenses
16 will decrease in a forward-looking network. This is so for two reasons. First,
17 productivity is improving over time and Verizon does not take this into account.
18 In other proceedings in which Verizon has introduced a FLC, it first adjusts
19 embedded expenses to make them "forward-looking" by applying a productivity
20 adjustment, absorbing inflation, and making certain other forward-looking
21 adjustments. No such adjustments are made to expenses by Verizon in Virginia.
22 Second, many of the embedded Verizon inefficiencies produced by labor-
23 intensive efforts to use technologically obsolete equipment to serve increasing
24 demand will not exist in the forward-looking environment. Moreover, as
25 telephone technology improves and equipment becomes more sophisticated, it

1 also becomes less labor-intensive and more “user-friendly” to operate and
2 maintain. In contrast to Verizon's embedded cost approach, these facts support a
3 forward-looking network adjustment factor that reduces forward-looking
4 operating expenses, and does not increase them, as Verizon proposes.

5 **Q. COULD YOU FURTHER EXPLAIN WHY AN FLC IS NOT NEEDED?**

6 A. Yes, Verizon claims that the use of ACFs to reflect the expense of providing UNEs
7 results in purchasers of UNEs realizing expense savings that have not been
8 identified or ascribed to any actual cost-cutting initiative. Verizon attributes these
9 alleged savings to a TELRIC construct which generally results in reduced levels of
10 investment compared with the embedded investment used to produce the ACF
11 ratios. Missing from Verizon’s discussion is an acknowledgement that, in addition
12 to TELRIC investment being generally lower than the investment in the existing
13 network, the mix of assets in the forward-looking network is also different than the
14 embedded mix. The forward-looking TELRIC construct allows for the construction
15 of an all-new facility using the most efficient assets available. Typically, more
16 efficient assets are those that are less expensive to operate and maintain that will, in
17 turn, result in lower overall expenses.

18 **Q. CAN YOU PROVIDE AN EXAMPLE OF A SHIFT IN THE ASSET MIX**
19 **THAT WILL RESULT IN LOWER OVERALL FORWARD-LOOKING**
20 **EXPENSES ABSENT ANY DIRECT LINK TO VERIZON COST-**
21 **CUTTING INITIATIVES?**

22 A. Yes. The shift in the forward-looking network to more fiber in the feeder facility is
23 a perfect example. The Verizon cost study assumes that fiber will be used in place
24 of copper beyond certain thresholds in the forward-looking feeder network. Because

1 of this assumption, there are more fiber-based feeder facilities in the forward-
2 looking network than in the embedded network. In addition to the fact that fiber
3 cable is less expensive on a per circuit basis than most copper cable, the cost of
4 maintaining fiber is considerably less than that of copper cable. Verizon's own cost
5 study shows a network expense ratio for aerial fiber cable of **[BEGIN VERIZON**
6 **PROPRIETARY] *** [END VERIZON PROPRIETARY]**, less than one-eighth
7 of the **[BEGIN VERIZON PROPRIETARY] *** [END VERIZON**
8 **PROPRIETARY]** factor for aerial metallic cable.⁴⁷ Table 3 below demonstrates
9 that even if one were to assume that cable investment costs for fiber and copper
10 were equal, the forward-looking network would enjoy lower expenses than the
11 embedded network.

12 **[BEGIN VERIZON PROPRIETARY]**

13 *******

14 **[END VERIZON PROPRIETARY]**

15
16 As Table 3 demonstrates, a shift in the design of the forward-looking
17 network from less-efficient copper feeder to more-efficient fiber feeder produces
18 an 88% reduction in operating expenses, even before the lower investment costs
19 of fiber are taken into account. Thus, the phenomenon of lower forward-looking
20 expenses that prompted Verizon to create the FLC adjustment factor is nothing
21 more than what should be reasonably expected by a shift to a more modern,
22 efficient, forward-looking asset base.

⁴⁷ See Verizon Cost Study Section 3.9 – Annual Cost Factors.

1 **Q. DOES VERIZON’S ARGUMENT ABOUT DISCOUNTS DEMONSTRATE**
2 **THAT AN FLC IS APPROPRIATE?**

3 A. No. Verizon argues that one reason for an FLC is that in a TELRIC network, new
4 entrants will be able to purchase the *same* equipment as Verizon uses in its
5 embedded network at steep discounts but there will be no reduction in expenses
6 with this equipment.⁴⁸ Verizon’s argument ignores the expense reductions that
7 will occur based on more efficient equipment. Moreover Verizon has not
8 provided any information that suggests that the discounts new entrants would be
9 able to achieve in a TELRIC network are more aggressive or favorable than those
10 that Verizon has been able to achieve in building its embedded network. Without
11 such information on the relative discount levels in the embedded and forward-
12 looking investments, no FLC or reverse FLC can be meaningfully applied.

13 **Q. HAVE YOU MODIFIED VERIZON’S FLC IN YOUR RESTATEMENT?**

14 A. Yes. We have eliminated Verizon’s FLC from our restatement of Verizon’s
15 forward-looking costs.

16 **I. CC/BC RATIO**

17 **Q. DOES VERIZON APPLY A CURRENT-COST-TO-BOOK-COST RATIO**
18 **TO ITS EMBEDDED INVESTMENTS TO BRING THEM TO CURRENT**
19 **LEVELS BEFORE COMPUTING ITS EMBEDDED EXPENSE RATIOS?**

20 A. No. In its cost study, Verizon has abandoned the standard application of a
21 current-cost-to-book-cost (“CC/BC”) ratio to bring its embedded investments to

⁴⁸ See Panel Testimony at 71.

1 1999 levels before computing the expense ratios. Verizon provides no
2 explanation of why this adjustment was eliminated from its cost study.

3 **Q. WHAT IS A CC/BC RATIO?**

4 A. A CC/BC ratio, as the name suggests, is a composite inflation index used to
5 inflate booked telephone plant investment to current price levels. It is typically
6 developed by asset account and is weighted by the relative amount of booked
7 investment placed in each year.

8 **Q. WHY IS THE APPLICATION OF A CC/BC RATIO NECESSARY?**

9 A. In Verizon's cost study, forward-looking expenses are estimated based on the ratio
10 of embedded expenses to investments. The calculated ratio is then applied to
11 estimated forward-looking investments. Application of the CC/BC ratio brings
12 Verizon's embedded investments, which are recorded on the books at the time of
13 acquisition, to a consistent basis with the operating expenses by accounting for
14 inflation that has occurred from the time the investments were placed on
15 Verizon's books through 1999 when the expenses were incurred. This step is
16 critical because the forward-looking investments to which the expense ratios are
17 applied also include all of the effects of inflation up through the time they are
18 assumed to be installed.

19 **Q. HOW DID YOU DEVELOP THE CC/BC RATIOS USED IN YOUR**
20 **RESTATEMENT?**

21 A. AT&T and WorldCom filed a discovery request to Verizon seeking the CC/BC
22 ratios necessary to bring Verizon's booked investment to 1999 levels. To date,
23 Verizon has not responded to this request. In our restatement, we used the CC/BC

1 ratios originally used by Verizon in the first UNE proceeding before the Virginia
2 SCC.

3 **J. ASSET LIVES**

4 **Q. HAVE YOU MADE CHANGES TO THE ASSET LIVES AND NET**
5 **SALVAGE VALUES USED BY VERIZON?**

6 A. We adjusted the Verizon asset lives and net salvage values to those most recently
7 prescribed for Verizon by the FCC as presented in the testimony of Mr. Lee.

8 **K. COST OF CAPITAL**

9 **Q. HAVE YOU MADE CHANGES TO THE COST OF CAPITAL AND**
10 **CAPITAL STRUCTURE THAT VERIZON USES IN ITS STUDY?**

11 A. Yes. Consistent with Mr. Hirshleifer's testimony, we adjusted the Verizon cost of
12 debt, cost of equity, and capital structure to be used in developing Verizon's
13 forward-looking economic costs to provide UNEs.

14 **L. MERGER SAVINGS**

15 **Q. DOES VERIZON INCLUDE AN ADJUSTMENT IN ORDER TO**
16 **REFLECT THE ANTICIPATED FUTURE SAVINGS RESULTING FROM**
17 **THE BA/NYNEX AND VERIZON/GTE MERGERS?**

18 A. Verizon failed to include a specific adjustment to reflect the anticipated future
19 savings associated with either the Bell Atlantic/NYNEX or Verizon/GTE mergers.
20 The UNE operating expenses presented by Verizon are developed based on the
21 ratio of 1999 operating expenses to 1999 investment.⁴⁹ To the extent that the
22 embedded inefficiencies have not yet been removed from the 1999 operating

⁴⁹ See Verizon Cost Study Part 2-Network Factors.

1 expenses and Verizon has already quantified the level of merger savings, those
2 merger savings must be reflected on a forward-looking basis. Indeed, the merger
3 savings projected to result from the Bell Atlantic/NYNEX merger were not
4 anticipated to be fully achieved until well after 1999, and the savings from the
5 Verizon/GTE mergers obviously were not included at that time.

6 **Q. HOW SHOULD THE COMMISSION TREAT COST SAVINGS THAT**
7 **WILL RESULT FROM THE RECENT MERGERS?**

8 A. The development of UNE rates in this proceeding must consider the forward-
9 looking cost savings resulting from the efficiencies produced by the recent
10 mergers. To reflect these anticipated savings, Verizon's joint and common cost
11 factor should be reduced by the amount of the anticipated savings.

12 **Q. HOW SHOULD THE LEVEL OF SUCH SAVINGS BE ESTIMATED?**

13 A. In its recent filings in New York, Verizon incorporated the impact of anticipated
14 merger savings by reducing the joint and common cost factor by a combined 2.6
15 percentage points (1.6% for the Bell Atlantic/NYNEX merger and 0.97% for the
16 Verizon/GTE merger).⁵⁰ While there were inconsistencies in the way Verizon
17 calculated each of the percentages that resulted in an understatement of the
18 amount of the reduction, we believe a 2.6 percentage point reduction from
19 Verizon Virginia's joint and common overhead cost percentage will produce a

⁵⁰ Verizon New York Filing Workpaper Part H, Section 3.11, Pages 5 and 5.1 of 5.

1 reasonable, albeit conservative, estimate of the amount of merger savings
2 attributable to UNEs in Virginia.

3 **M. REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES**

4 **Q. HAVE YOU REVIEWED VERIZON'S DEVELOPMENT OF ITS**
5 **FORWARD-LOOKING CABLE REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE**
6 **EXPENSES?**

7 A. Yes. Verizon computes the maintenance and repair expense for metallic cable
8 based on the embedded relationship of its current metallic cable repair and
9 maintenance expenditures to its embedded metallic cable investment.⁵¹ Before
10 computing the ratio, however, Verizon adjusts the actual repair expenses by
11 reducing them by five percent for "Latest Design Standards." Verizon provides
12 no explanation for this adjustment, which we believe falls short of the actual
13 adjustment required to capture the maintenance and repair benefits of an all new
14 metallic cable facility. When the new forward-looking plant specifically designed
15 to serve current demand is installed, both repair expenditures associated with
16 defective pairs and rearrangement expenses will decline from their historic levels.
17 As we explain below, a conservative adjustment is a 30% reduction to repair and
18 maintenance expenses, which we have incorporated in our restatement.

⁵¹ See Verizon Cost Study Part 2 – Network Factors.

1 **Q. DOES VERIZON’S STUDY INCLUDE SUFFICIENT ADJUSTMENTS TO**
2 **ITS CABLE REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES FOR THE**
3 **FORWARD-LOOKING PLANT?**

4 **A.** No. Verizon’s cost study reflects a five percent reduction in its actual repair
5 expenses to account for the reduced maintenance and repair expenses associated
6 with a new metallic cable facility. This is far too low. A conservative estimate of
7 savings would be 30%.

8 **Q. WHAT IS THE PROCESS THAT CAUSES THE “M & R” DOLLARS TO**
9 **BE EXPENDED IN DISTRIBUTION AREAS?**

10 **A.** Verizon’s cost study bases its maintenance and repair costs on the high costs in its
11 embedded plant. But the reason that Verizon’s costs are so high is because of the
12 age of its plant and its process for repairing that plant. As copper plant ages, the
13 cumulative effects of work activities and environment lead to an increase in
14 customer trouble reports. In addition, the cost of responding to each report
15 increases as plant ages. In the cable plant, trouble reports are typically cleared by
16 a line and station transfer in which a new wire pair is assigned to the customer
17 without fixing the original problem or even determining the root cause. This
18 cause may eventually result in a problem on the new line as well. For example,
19 water that affected the first wire pair may eventually affect the second wire pair.
20 As the plant ages, the reassignment of wire pairs to clear troubles reduces the
21 available spare facilities. Eventually, even new service installation requires
22 facility modifications to provision services. If, for example, there are no more
23 spare cables at a telephone pole that can be assigned to a customer, a drop wire

1 must be put in place from a nearby pole. This significantly increases the cost of
2 installing the new line or clearing the trouble.

3 **Q. WHAT CORRECTIVE ACTION DOES VERIZON TAKE TO ADDRESS**
4 **THOSE ISSUES?**

5 A. When Verizon determines that the cost of maintenance and repair in a particular
6 area of the plant has become too high, it will then rehabilitate or stabilize the
7 plant. Verizon determines where to conduct such rehabilitation and stabilization
8 through a Facility Analysis Plan. The Facility Analysis Plan includes an
9 assessment of expenses associated with facility modifications. The Facility
10 Analysis Plan also includes an evaluation of the average time to perform certain
11 tasks; the number of craft personnel who are needed to complete the job; and the
12 average wages that must be paid to these personnel. The location of the plant is
13 reported to a tracking unit, and the plant is ranked according to total reported
14 "M & R" expenses. Based on this information, an engineer then proceeds to
15 rehabilitate or stabilize the high cost areas of the plant. Upon completion of the
16 work, the cable is tracked to ensure that the trouble reports and facility
17 modifications have been eliminated or sharply curtailed.

18 **Q. HAS VERIZON PRODUCED DOCUMENTS THAT WOULD INDICATE**
19 **ANY PROJECTED SAVINGS FROM REHABILITATION WORK**
20 **ACTIVITIES?**

21 A. Yes, documents that Verizon-Maryland produced in discovery in the related
22 Maryland UNE proceeding indicate that Verizon-Maryland engineers anticipate
23 achieving a 90% reduction in maintenance expenses when they rehabilitate areas
24 of plant. Although we have asked in discovery in this proceeding for Verizon's

1 outside plant estimate cases for recent distribution relief jobs, Verizon has not yet
2 provided these documents. We believe these documents will show that Verizon
3 expects in excess of a 90% reduction in maintenance expenses after new
4 distribution cable replaces older, deteriorated plant – as was the case in Maryland.

5 **Q. HAS VERIZON-VIRGINIA SUBMITTED DATA IN THIS PROCEEDING**
6 **THAT WOULD GIVE AN INDICATION OF THE NATURE OF THE**
7 **CONDITION OF THE PLANT IN VIRGINIA?**

8 A. Yes. As noted above, information extracted from the LART data submitted in this
9 case indicates that 6.3% of all available lines in Verizon-Virginia distribution
10 areas across the state are defective. This percentage of defective pairs suggests
11 that there are ample opportunities for rehabilitation of the plant. Rehabilitation of
12 plant in high cost areas – or introduction of new plant in those areas as would
13 occur in a reconstructed network – should yield a substantial reduction in
14 maintenance and repair expenses in the future.

15 **Q. GIVEN THAT VERIZON-MARYLAND ANTICIPATES A 90%**
16 **MAINTENANCE SAVINGS GOING FORWARD AS A RESULT OF**
17 **PLANT REHABILITATION, WHAT HAS VERIZON-VIRGINIA**
18 **PROJECTED WITH RESPECT TO “M AND R EXPENSES?”**

19 A. Verizon makes only a 5% downward adjustment to the “R” dollars for copper and
20 drop-wire, and no additional adjustments to “M” dollars.

21 **Q. ARE VERIZON-VIRGINIA’S “M & R” DOLLAR ADJUSTMENTS**
22 **REASONABLE?**

23 A. No. Mr. Riolo’s extensive experience in rehabilitating distribution plant comports
24 with savings projected by Verizon-MD of 90% going forward. With so many
25 opportunities available to Verizon-Virginia for plant rehabilitation and

1 stabilization, a very conservative, reasonable savings of 30% in "M & R" dollars
2 is achievable through rehabilitation. Even greater savings would be achieved in a
3 reconstructed network with entirely new plant throughout the network.

4 **N. Y2K EXPENSES**

5 **Q. DOES VERIZON INCLUDE YEAR 2000 COMPLIANCE EXPENSES IN**
6 **ITS FORWARD-LOOKING COST STUDY?**

7 A. Verizon bases the forward-looking operating expenses in its cost study on its
8 actual expenditures for 1999. During 1999, substantial efforts were underway at
9 most companies, including Verizon, to ensure that computer systems were year
10 2000 compliant. These one-time expenditures to ensure compliance will not be
11 incurred by Verizon or any entrant into the local telephone market that enters after
12 2000. As such, these expenditures should be excluded from Verizon's studies.
13 We removed these "Y2K" related expenditures in our restatement of Verizon's
14 study.

15 **O. ADVERTISING EXPENSES**

16 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHAT AMOUNT OF VERIZON'S ADVERTISING**
17 **EXPENSES SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN ITS FORWARD-LOOKING**
18 **COSTS?**

19 A. Verizon's cost study attempts to charge CLECs for Verizon's retail advertising.
20 All of Verizon's advertising expenses should be considered retail avoided and thus
21 removed in their entirety from Verizon's forward-looking costs. Verizon's
22 proposal to include any advertising expenses in the development of its claimed
23 UNE costs is absurd and should be rejected outright. Effectively, Verizon would
24 like its competitors to pay for Verizon's advertisements for a network that its

1 competitors will not be able to lease through UNEs, and which may be more cost-
2 effective than the network construct used to set UNE rates. In short, Verizon's
3 inclusion of advertising expenses – which have historically been spent on
4 advertising for retail services – for the development of its forward-looking
5 economic costs to provide UNEs must be rejected.

6 **P. NON-RECURRING AND OTHER SUPPORT FACTOR**
7 **ADJUSTMENTS**

8 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE NON-RECURRING ADJUSTMENT.**

9 A. In its cost study, Verizon reduces its 1999 operating expenses by the amount of
10 non-recurring provisioning revenue it received in 1999 in an effort to avoid
11 recovering these costs both as part of the recurring rates and again as part of the
12 non-recurring rates. As Mr. Walsh describes in his testimony, Verizon's proposed
13 adjustment falls wide of the mark. Because many of Verizon's daily maintenance
14 and rearrangement activities involve tasks identical to those Verizon claims
15 should be the subject of a non-recurring charge, most of Verizon's "non-
16 recurring" activities are already being recovered in the recurring rates and should
17 thus not be recovered as a separate charge. However, in order to avoid an under-
18 recovery of these recurring expenses, it is necessary to reverse Verizon's removal
19 of non-recurring provisioning revenues from 1999 expense. We have done so in
20 our restatement.

21 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE OTHER SUPPORT FACTOR ADJUSTMENTS**
22 **YOU MADE.**

23 A. Similar to the non-recurring adjustment, Verizon makes an adjustment in its other
24 support factor calculations to remove recurring OSS charges which Verizon

1 asserts should be covered by a separate OSS charge. As Terry Murray explains,
2 the costs Verizon seeks to recover through the separate OSS charge are already
3 being recovered through recurring charges and Verizon's proposed charge should
4 be rejected. However, to avoid an under-recovery by Verizon, we have eliminated
5 Verizon's adjustment to its other support factor.

6 **Q. SUMMARY OF LOOP COST RESTATEMENT**

7 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE RESULTS OF YOUR RESTATEMENT OF**
8 **VERIZON'S CLAIMED LOOP COSTS.**

9 A. We have restated Verizon's loop cost study incorporating all of the modifications
10 we discuss above. Table 4 summarizes our results by density zone and statewide
11 for the two-wire loop and compares them to Verizon's results.

Table 4
Summary of Restated Two Wire Loop Results

Density Zone	Verizon	Restated Verizon
2-Wire Loop Dens Cell 1	\$19.49	\$5.13
2-Wire Loop Dens Cell 2	\$29.69	\$7.54
2-Wire Loop Dens Cell 3	\$48.93	\$12.07
2-Wire Loop Statewide	\$25.12	\$6.46

12
13 As we discussed previously, these loop results are very close to those
14 produced by the Synthesis Model, however, for all the reasons stated above, these
15 restated Verizon rates are not TELRIC.

16 Details of our calculations are included as part of our electronic
17 workpapers. Because these workpapers are restated versions of electronic models
18 filed and deemed proprietary by Verizon, our electronic workpapers must also be
19 treated as proprietary. Our workpapers are being provided on a CD-ROM to the

1 Commission, Verizon, and other parties that have signed Verizon's protective
2 agreement.

3 **R. RESTATEMENT OF OTHER UNES**

4 **Q. DID YOU RESTATE OTHER OF VERIZON'S UNE COSTS IN**
5 **ADDITION TO THE TWO WIRE LOOPS?**

6 A. Yes. For many of the other UNES for which Verizon has developed costs, we
7 have restated Verizon's results by applying, where appropriate, the relevant
8 adjustment from our two-wire loop restatement discussed above. In addition, we
9 have been provided restated investments for certain of Verizon's proposed UNES
10 from other AT&T/WorldCom witnesses. We have processed these restated
11 investments through the Verizon cost models to produce revised recurring UNE
12 rates. A complete summary of all of the restated recurring rates is included as
13 Exhibit 1 to this testimony. Details of all of our calculations are included in our
14 workpapers.

15 **IV. SWITCH COSTS**

16 **A. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY**

17 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION OF THE PANEL**
18 **TESTIMONY?**

19 A. This part of the testimony demonstrates that Verizon's claimed switch UNE costs
20 substantially exceed forward-looking economic costs and should be rejected.
21 Specifically, Verizon's methodological approach to developing its costs for
22 switching violates long-run forward-looking economic cost principles.

1 First, Verizon's cost study does not assume the purchase of new digital
2 switches at new switch prices (with new switch price discounts) available from
3 Verizon's switch vendors. Thus, the study does not satisfy basic TELRIC
4 principles for modeling a reconstructed local network. Instead of using the new
5 switch purchase discounts offered by its vendors, Verizon relied solely on the
6 smaller "growth" discounts – available for adding-on capacity to existing
7 switches – thereby substantially inflating its claimed switch costs.

8 Second, Verizon's proposed switch engineering and installation factors are
9 overstated and must be adjusted to reflect the costs of an efficient company
10 operating in a competitive environment.

11 Third, Verizon has misallocated substantial costs to the usage-related UNE
12 elements, thereby overstating the UNE minute-of-use elements.

13 There are numerous additional deficiencies in the study including
14 understated amounts of IDLC, inappropriate line and trunk port utilization factors,
15 and incorrect and unsubstantiated input data used in feature cost development and
16 Right-to-Use ("RTU") costs.

17 This testimony also demonstrates that the methodology Verizon proposes
18 for development of the switch portion of the reciprocal compensation rates should
19 be rejected. Verizon seeks to treat switch costs for UNEs and reciprocal
20 compensation in fundamentally different ways. This is inappropriate. The switch
21 UNE rates – after making the required corrections to Verizon's cost study –
22 should serve as the switch component in the reciprocal compensation rate.

1 AT&T/WorldCom has restated Verizon's proposed switch UNE rates and
2 reciprocal compensation rates in Attachment 1 to this testimony.

3 **B. VERIZON ERRED IN ITS USE OF GROWTH-ONLY SWITCH**
4 **PRICES**

5 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW VERIZON DEVELOPED ITS CLAIMED**
6 **SWITCH UNE COSTS.**

7 A. Verizon used the Telcordia SCIS models to develop claimed port, port additives,
8 and usage investments. Multiple loadings were added for power, engineering,
9 installation, etc. and then annual cost factors were applied to convert the
10 investments to monthly costs and expenses were added to develop the purported
11 TELRIC cost. Finally, various overhead loadings were added to calculate
12 proposed prices.

13 Because the starting point for Verizon's cost study is switching
14 investment, if Verizon's investment inputs are wrong, as they clearly are, then
15 Verizon's claimed costs and ultimately its proposed switch UNE prices likewise
16 will be wrong – as they are by a wide margin.

17 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE ROLE OF SWITCH PRICES AND SWITCH**
18 **DISCOUNTS IN VERIZON'S COST STUDY.**

19 A. The SCIS model has only the list prices for switches in its databases. In the real
20 world, Verizon and all other large telephone companies never pay the list price,
21 but instead receive substantial discounts off the list price from the switching
22 vendors. Thus, in order for SCIS to compute a net price, discount inputs must be
23 entered into the program.

1 **Q. PLEASE DEFINE “NEW” AND “GROWTH” SWITCH DISCOUNTS.**

2 A. Switch manufacturers typically provide a larger discount for purchasing a new
3 switch and a lower discount for purchasing add-on growth equipment to an
4 existing switch.

5 **Q. WHICH SWITCH PRICES AND DISCOUNTS DID VERIZON USE?**

6 A. Verizon used growth discounts in calculating its switch prices.

7 **Q. WHY IS IT INCORRECT FOR VERIZON TO USE GROWTH**
8 **DISCOUNTS IN THE COST STUDY?**

9 A. The use of growth-only prices violates long-run, forward-looking economic cost
10 methodology, which requires use of new switch prices. In fact, Verizon’s
11 methodology inappropriately mixes and matches different, and conflicting,
12 methodologies in the same study.

13 Moreover, it is simply incorrect to use a growth discount as an input to
14 SCIS because SCIS is designed to compute the cost of a new switch. Each of
15 these issues is addressed in more detail below.

16 **Q. DID VERIZON FOLLOW TELRIC IN USING GROWTH-ONLY PRICES?**

17 A. No. Verizon does not take a long-run view that assumes the entire switch’s
18 forward-looking replacement cost must be used but instead takes a short-run view
19 that it has named “actual.” Consistent with this view, Verizon declares that it has
20 no definitive plans to purchase new digital switches⁵² and claims that the only

⁵² Verizon response to AT&T Data Request Number 9 – Request 30.

1 relevant cost is the price of growth equipment being added to existing switches.

2 In Verizon's words, the forward-looking switching technology (and associated

3 switching cost) "represents the mixture of switching equipment components

4 Verizon is purchasing incrementally to upgrade and expand its switch network, on

5 a forward-looking basis."⁵³ This is directly contrary to TELRIC principles.

6 **Q. DOES VERIZON APPLY THIS SHORT-RUN APPROACH**
7 **CONSISTENTLY IN ITS SWITCH COST STUDY?**

8 A. No. Verizon uses this assumption only to determine what price discount to use.

9 Verizon then applies the growth price discount to all switch equipment, not just

10 the add-on equipment. Verizon thus includes the entire cost of a new switch in its

11 cost study, but priced at higher short-run marginal pricing structures that do not

12 reflect the discounts available for a new switch.

13 **Q. WHAT APPROACH IS MANDATED BY THE FCC RULES?**

14 A. The FCC's TELRIC rules assume the long-run in which all investments are

15 avoidable – thus leading to the FCC rule that a new network be built using the

16 existing wire center locations, to serve all reasonably foreseeable demand, as

17 described in more detail in Ms. Murray's testimony.

18 **Q. DID VERIZON FOLLOW THIS APPROACH?**

19 A. No. Verizon confuses these straightforward principles when it states that it

20 applies discounts it "actually receives" in the future for equipment it will be

⁵³ See Panel Testimony at 189.

1 “purchasing incrementally to upgrade and expand its switch network, on a
2 forward-looking basis”.⁵⁴ Verizon claims it is using forward-looking
3 assumptions, but fails to consider the long-run when calculating its costs.⁵⁵

4 **Q. HOW DID VERIZON DETERMINE ITS SWITCH DISCOUNT INPUTS**
5 **IN THIS CASE?**

6 A. Verizon studied actual Lucent and Siemens equipment purchases for one year and
7 compared the list price with the net price to determine its growth discount
8 inputs.⁵⁶ Even if it were correct to use growth prices in a TELRIC study, which it
9 is not, Verizon’s claim that one year’s worth of purchases could accurately reflect
10 the type and amounts of switch equipment purchases it expects to make in the
11 future is incorrect.

12 Indeed, Verizon has admitted that the purchase information it used to
13 develop the discounts is not appropriate for determining the price of a new
14 switch.⁵⁷

15 **Q. DOES VERIZON’S APPROACH CORRECTLY CALCULATE TELRIC**
16 **BASED COSTS?**

17 A. No. Verizon is assuming the discounted price structure of incrementally growing
18 its existing switches, not the discounted price structure for newly constructed

⁵⁴ *Id.* at 188-189

⁵⁵ A glaring omission of references to the long-run is evident in the Cost Panel Testimony at 188-189.

⁵⁶ Panel Testimony at 190-193

1 switches that can serve the entire demand. It combines a short-run approach to
2 prices (which are higher than long-run new switch prices) with a long-run
3 approach of including the total cost of the switch (which is higher than the short-
4 run incremental cost of including just the growth equipment), thereby selectively
5 mixing methodologies and inappropriately inflating UNE costs. Verizon's mixed
6 approach directly violates the FCC's rules requiring prices based on the cost of a
7 reconstructed network that will serve the entire quantity of the network element
8 provided.

9 **Q. CAN SCIS BE USED TO PRODUCE A CORRECT SWITCH PRICE**
10 **USING ONLY GROWTH DISCOUNTS?**

11 A. No. SCIS is a "static" model and is designed to estimate the price of a new
12 switch.⁵⁸ SCIS was not designed to model dynamically a switch that grows over
13 time.⁵⁹ Verizon's input of only growth discounts is a misuse of the SCIS model.
14 A significant portion of the SCIS-derived price for a switch is for the "getting

⁵⁷ Verizon responses to AT&T Data Requests 9-33, 34 and 35 state that the existing contracts that were used to develop the Verizon discounts "would not control the price of a new switch" and they "cover only additions to existing switches."

⁵⁸ A Telcordia letter, dated July 30, 2001 to Mr. Bob Beyer in Verizon's Boston, MA, office, discussing SCIS explicitly states: "These prices reflect the cost to purchase a *new* 5ESS switching system." The letter was provided by Verizon in discovery as an attachment to Verizon Response to ATT Data Request 9-2 (emphasis added).

⁵⁹ Performing a dynamic cost study is extremely difficult, requires extensive demand analysis, and has not been used, to our knowledge, in the telephone industry for determining the costs of retail services or wholesale elements. SCIS was designed and developed, along with all other engineering economic cost models of which I am aware, to perform a "static" analysis.

1 started” equipment, or first cost of the switch.⁶⁰ This equipment is purchased with
2 the initial installation and would receive a new switch discount. In addition, all
3 lines and trunks purchased at the initial installation of a new switch (and usually
4 lines and trunks purchased for a number of years afterward) would also receive
5 the new switch discount.⁶¹

6 Verizon improperly used the growth switch discount in running the SCIS
7 model, and the model applied that discount uniformly across all switch
8 components, including the large “getting started” cost and all the lines and trunks
9 purchased as part of a new switch. This results in a serious overstatement of the
10 total switch investment. It is incorrect to enter the “growth” discount into SCIS
11 when the program will ultimately apply that lower growth discount to equipment
12 that Telcordia itself states is intended to model a new switch purchase with a
13 higher new switch discount.

14 **Q. HAS A COURT ADDRESSED THIS ISSUE?**

15 **A.** Yes, last year, the United States District Court for the District of Delaware
16 explicitly rejected as contrary to TELRIC Verizon’s no new digital switch
17 argument and its attempt to avoid larger new switch purchase discounts.⁶²

⁶⁰ **[BEGIN VERIZON PROPRIETARY] *** [END VERIZON PROPRIETARY]**

⁶¹ Most new switches are replacing an existing switch that was already serving the wire center. In such a case, all replacement lines and trunks purchased as part of the new switch would receive the new switch discount.

⁶² *Bell Atlantic-Delaware, Inc. v. McMahon*, 80 F. Supp. 2d 218, 236-239 (D. Del. 2000).

1 **Q. WHAT NEW SWITCH PRICE SHOULD VERIZON USE?**

2 A. The cost study should be long-run. The cost of a *new* digital switch is an
3 appropriate estimate for the next generation of switch technology and should be
4 used in the cost study.

5 **Q. WOULDN'T PACKET SWITCHES BE EVEN MORE EFFICIENT?**

6 A. No. At some future date, packet-based switches will probably be the primary
7 switching vehicle in the network, but at present, it is premature to assume a
8 network using packet technology for voice transmission. Efficient companies will
9 replace digital switches with packet switches only when they are at least
10 functionally equivalent and cheaper on a unit basis than purchasing or growing
11 digital switches.

12 **Q. HOW SHOULD THE PRICE FOR A NEW SWITCH BE DETERMINED?**

13 A. There are two primary sources for identifying the cost of a new switch:
14 competitive bids and switch manufacturer contracts.⁶³ Verizon states that the
15 purchasing unit of Verizon Communications, Inc. uses a competitive bid
16 procedure for the purchase of new switches. The fact that Verizon uses
17 competitive bidding procedures to purchase new switches, however, does not
18 necessarily mean the contract prices are not available – only that the contract

⁶³ The switch manufacturers typically maintain long-term baseline contracts that include terms, conditions and prices for switch purchases with their customers. These contracts are often updated via amendments, etc. to reflect special short-term conditions, such as special negotiations on high-volume growth equipment, for example. When referring to (footnote continued)